



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,406	09/15/2003	Deepak Ayyagari	8371-0162	5033
73496 7590 06/19/2009 Stolowitz Ford Cowger LLP/Sharp 621 SW Morrison St Suite 600 Portland, OR 97205				
EXAMINER				
WILSON, ROBERT W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2419				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/19/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/663,406

Applicant(s)

AYYAGARI, DEEPAK

Examiner

ROBERT W. WILSON

Art Unit

2419

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,2 and 17-27 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3,5-9,11,12,16,28 and 29 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/15/04 & 9/10/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notice of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Referring to claim 13, what is meant by "the centralized network"? Applicant preamble defines a "centralized wired communication system". Is the applicant referring to "the centralized wired communication system"?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Machin (U.S. Patent Pub. No.: 2002/0032806) in view of Raphaeli (U.S. Patent Pub. No.: 2003/0103521) which are both IDS documents of record further in view of Chow (U.S. Patent No.: 6,148,349)

Referring to claim 13, Machin teaches: a method of establishing a multicast connection in a centralized wired communication system (Figure 19B performs the method) the method comprising:

Creating point-to-point connection between a source device and destination device (Pg 14 Para [0158] and connection identifier is set up between the transport interface and destination per Pg 8 Para [0091])

Art Unit: 2419

Replicating application data such that the replicate exists for a destination device and transmitting the replicate on the point-to-point connections (Application data encapsulated into a PPP or TCP/IP packet sent on a point to point connection to an end point per Fig 19B or per Pg 14 Para [0158])

Where in each connection is associated with a corresponding service access point of the transport layer of the source device (Each connection is associated with application data through 482 per Fig 19B or SAP where 482 is above TCP/IP and PPP or network and therefore is transport layer of the source device)

Each connection is assigned a connection identifier for use in routing data packets from the source device to selected ports in the destination device (connection identifier which inherently is globally unique throughout the network for routing data packets from the source device per Pg 9 Para [0091])

Machin does not expressly call for: replicating data for at least two destination devices or connection identifier that globally unique throughout the centralized network

Chow teaches: connection identifier that is globally unique throughout the centralized network (globally unique id assign which corresponds to a ION or IO node per col. 15 lines 22 to 26 and per col. 4 lines 45 to 50)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the connection identifier that is globally unique throughout the centralized network of Chow in place of the connection identifier of Machin in order to communicate with different nodes and be able to uniquely identify the connection in order to improve performance.

The combination of Machin and Chow do not teach: replicating data for at least two destination devices

Raphaeli teaches: replicating data for at least two destination devices (Pg 2 Para [0020])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add replicating data for at least two destination devices of Raphaeli to the device of Machin and Raphaeli in order to communicate with multiple devices over a powerline infrastructure which can be used to save cost associated with adding wiring instead of utilizing the existing infrastructure wiring.

In addition Machin teaches:

Referring to claim 15 the combination of Machin, Chow, and Raphaeli teach: the method of claim 13 and at least two devices and application data .

The combination of Machin and Chow do not expressly call for: at least two devices comprises all possible destination devices

Raphaeli teaches: at least two devices comprise all possible destination devices (Figure 1 in which broadcast occurs per Pg 2 Para [0020])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the at least two devices comprise all possible destination devices of Raphaeli to the network of the combination of Machin, Chow, and Raphaeli in order to broadcast data to all devices on a common wire.

5. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Machin (U.S.

Patent Pub. No.: 2002/0032806) in view of Raphaeli (U.S. Patent Pub. No.: 2003/0103521)

which are both IDS documents of record in view of Chow (U.S. Patent No.: 6,148,349) further in view of Johansson (U.S. Patent No.: 6,873,624)

Referring to claim 14, the combination of Machin, Chow, and Raphaeli teach the method of claim 13 and at least two devices and broadcasting.

The combination of Machin, Chow, and Raphael do not expressly call for: less than all possible destination devices

Johansson teaches: less than all possible destination devices (virtual LAN can be created out of an number of devices based upon MAC address or less than the total number of devices per col. 1 lines 24 to 40 and these VLAN can be broadcast via virtual broadcast domain per col. 5 lines 1 to 7)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the less than all possible destination address of Johansson in place of broadcasting to all devices of the combination of Machin and Raphaeli by setting up virtual broadcast VLANs in order to be more selecting in which devices creating less traffic.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 3, 5-13, 16, & 28-29 are allowed. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Claims 3, 5-13, & 28-29 are considered allowable since no prior art reference or combination of prior art references disclose or suggest the combination of limitations specified in the independent claims including:

Sending a request to the central coordinator for a connection, the request including the connection type and the connection specification; in the central coordinator, granting the request for a connection and assigning a connection identifier (CID) that is unique over the centralized wired network and associating the assigned unique connection identifier with the selected service access point" in combination with other claim limitations as specified in claim 3.

"providing a local bandwidth manager in each device attached to the centralized network in an attached device, receiving a broadcast message from a user application in that device and storing the broadcast message in a buffer; in the local bandwidth manager responsive to the buffer broadcast message sending a bandwidth request to a central coordinator attached to the wired network " in combination with other claim limitations as specified in claim 13.

Response to Amendment

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3, 5-16, & 28-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Refer to the above rejection for details.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT W. WILSON whose telephone number is (571)272-3075. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dang Ton can be reached on 571/272-3171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert W Wilson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2419

RWW
6/15/09